

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the third Monday in October of each year as Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 344. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (by request):

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on Cold War Strategy; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature urging the Congress of the United States to assure the designation of a delivery point on the Great Lakes for ships built for the Federal Government in order to provide equality of opportunity to bid for such contracts and further urged Congress to direct contracts for shipbuilding to Wisconsin shipbuilding yards which have a reputation for turning out fine, seaworthy vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCINTIRE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine memorializing Congress to equalize retirement benefits for retired members of the Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the 71st General Assembly, House of Representatives, State of Illinois requesting the Department of the Army to proceed with all possible expedition to appropriate funds to enable a survey for flood control and allied purposes, authorized on July 3, 1958, of the Calumet River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to equalize retirement benefits for retired members of the Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 6485. A bill for the relief of Annibale Cuozzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 6486. A bill for the relief of Osman Shadi Gunay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6487. A bill for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemonelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H.R. 6488. A bill for the relief of Maria Kahale de Sami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 6489. A bill for the relief of Aristides Evangelou Katsikes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 6490. A bill for the relief of Colbert Colgate Held and Charles W. Shellhorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 6491. A bill for the relief of Soo Yung Rupert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 6492. A bill for the relief of Zlata Duhovnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 6493. A bill for the relief of Robert Dolton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 6494. A bill for the relief of Momcilo Bjelanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6495. A bill to admit the vessel *Martha Washington* to American registry and to permit its use in the coastwise trade while it is owned by the Cherry Grove Ferry Corp.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

156. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Orange, N.Y., memorializing the Congress of the United States to further suspend the operation of the so-called Byrd amendment to the Federal road program; to the Committee on Public Works.

157. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eugenio C. Nicolas, Manila, Philippines, relative to war damages payable to the Nicolas Estates; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### This We Owe to Our Country

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my answer to a letter recently received from Mr. Charles H. Percy, chairman, Republican committee on program and progress:

#### THIS WE OWE TO OUR COUNTRY

APRIL 9, 1959.

CHARLES H. PERCY,  
Chairman, Republican Committee on Program and Progress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERCY: I was pleased to have your letter of April 6. It states in part, "it is our belief that your own observations on the following questions would be invaluable to us in our efforts."

Your questions and my answers follow:

1. "What are the enduring principles by which Republicans must guide themselves now and in the future?"

Honest, efficient government. Oppose with all of our might, the wasteful spending of the people's tax dollar.

2. "What, in your opinion, are the chief dogmas we must discard?"

We have already discarded too many Republican dogmas. While those dogmas were operating, we built here the greatest Nation on earth. We must recapture many of those lost Republican dogmas.

3. "Trying to look ahead 10 or 15 years, what are the greatest problems you foresee for the United States and the Republican Party?"

Stay out of war, maintain a balanced budget, and prove to the so-called little fellow that he will suffer first and most from inflation caused by a constant unbalanced budget.

4. "In the same period, what are the greatest opportunities you foresee for the United States and the Republican Party?"

Broad publicity reaching into every home in America, reaffirming the Republican principles of the free private enterprise system for which we firmly stand; invite every loyal American to join hands with us, that they and their children may continue to enjoy the profits and blessings of liberty.

5. "Have you any other observations you think would be helpful to this committee in its attempt to state principles and objectives as well as analyze problems and opportunities?"

Yes, we should employ several of the very best editorial writers to be found. They should be scattered north, south, east, and west; they should take the offensive for our party. Publicize the virtues of individual

Republican candidates from the courthouse to the White House, and nail the radicals, labor racketeers, and leftwingers in the opposition party to the mast with no holds barred. Use effective salesmanship for our party first, and then fight the lying opposition with truth and might. This we owe to our country.

Respectfully submitted,

BEN F. JENSEN,  
Representative in Congress for the  
Seventh Iowa District.

### A National Lottery

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that the people in the State of Oklahoma finally got smart by wiping out hypocrisy after 51 years of prohibition.

The Oklahomans voted to repeal not because they could not get liquor. The bootleggers were there to supply them

with all they could drink. The good citizens of that State decided that as long as people wanted to drink then the best thing to do would be to repeal the law, get rid of the bootleggers and legally tax this thriving industry.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will also get smart and realize that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in human beings and that by proper Government regulations, supervision, and control we can bring into the coffers of our Federal Treasury \$10 billion a year in additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of my national lottery bill would not only satisfy the American gambling spirit but would, in addition, wipe out a large segment of our professional gamblers, legally tap a lucrative industry and provide enough money for a badly needed tax cut and reduction of our national debt.

**Statement by Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey, Before House Ways and Means Committee on Unemployment Compensation, April 15, 1959**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER  
OF NEW JERSEY**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, April 16, 1959*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I would like to insert in the RECORD the testimony which I gave yesterday before the House Ways and Means Committee on unemployment compensation:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the committee's kind invitation to appear here today and the opportunity afforded me to express my deep and growing concern over the serious inadequacies in the unemployment compensation programs administered by our States. I have equal concern for the failure of the Federal Government to bring about much needed improvements in this badly neglected area of our economy.

I am heartened by the studied approach the members of this committee have taken to this important problem and I am confident the fruit of its attention to unemployment compensation matters will be a vastly improved program benefiting the millions of American workers who are now, or who may be in the future listed in the unemployed column.

I suggest that the legislative vehicles that will most efficiently and most expeditiously bring about the improved program we are all seeking is H.R. 3563, a bill for which I am privileged to be a cosponsor.

Passage of this bill would not only place the Federal Government in its rightful position of leadership in the field of unemployment compensation by providing for a standardization of State programs and fiscal guarantees, but it would, in addition, eliminate the inadequate provisions of this State's programs.

Most important, passage of H.R. 3563 would bring an end to the Federal Government's

patchwork approach to the serious problems stemming from programs which pay the unemployed too little for too short a period.

As you may know, when the unemployment insurance programs were conceived in the depression years of the 1930's, 3 percent of payrolls was agreed upon as a proper rate to finance benefits. Since the very inception of the programs there has been a steady decline in the percent of payroll level to finance benefits.

The unemployment insurance programs were established with a view to paying an unemployed worker approximately 50 percent of his wage loss. In the early years, following the establishment of the program, there was near attainment of this goal.

Today, as this committee well knows, the percentage of loss of income made up by unemployment insurance payments is little over one-third of income lost through unemployment.

Among other shortcomings which H.R. 3563 seeks to overcome is the decline in the benefits received by the unemployed. It stipulates, as you know, benefits of not less than 50 percent of weekly income lost. This is the same goal established in the early thirties and here we are 20 years later still seeking it. I hope, and I am confident, that this time we will make it. However, this will be only if the standard is set by the Federal Government.

I hesitate to discuss provisions of the bill with which I know the members of the committee are thoroughly familiar. I do so only for emphasis in the record of points I consider to be pertinent.

It is most distressing that in this age of jet propulsion we have moved toward improvements in so vital an area of our national economy at a horse and buggy pace. In voting the extension of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act recently, we merely made another patchwork effort. The bill now being considered by this committee will bring an end to such crash measures as those the Congress has been compelled to enact in the past to keep our unemployed from near starvation.

We are seeking little more than the standards which were felt necessary when the unemployment compensation program was established more than 20 years ago. We are assuring a uniformity that will be fair to all of our States and work a hardship on none.

H.R. 3563 will take the tangle of State programs, with their great diversity of standards, rates levied, benefits paid, and the duration of payment, and apply a standardized program that will benefit the unemployed workers and give assurance of better protection to the worker who may someday find himself in the ranks of the unemployed.

This bill will go a long way in better equipping the Nation to combat another recession, for by providing sufficient and more realistic benefits there is stimulation of the economy through the maintenance of purchasing power at proper levels.

It is obvious to those familiar with the antiquated provisions of many State programs and the inadequacy of these programs that improvements are long past due. The changes advocated by this administration which would deny Federal leadership in this important field and leave the burden and initiative for improvement with the individual States, offer neither a solution to the problem nor the guidance and support for the States that are found in the bill presently before this committee.

There is, unfortunately, no evidence that unemployment particularly in the more distressed areas, will decline sharply enough in coming months to reach a normal level. Unless the Congress takes action to approve a standard and stabilized program of unemployment compensation, we may expect

to be called upon at the next session to apply another patch in the form of further extension of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act.

In the Newark, N.J., labor area, which encompasses my own congressional district in Hudson County, unemployment increased by 13,000 in a recent 2-month period and now stands at 8.9 percent of the total labor force. There is a 10-percent increase in unemployment over this same period last year.

These are figures that cause great concern. Ours, like so many others with which the committee is familiar, is a distressed labor market.

The committee is conscious of the interest of our State Governors in this problem. A number of these State executives have called on the Congress to set up minimum standards for all States such as are provided in the bill you are considering.

The distinguished chief executive of my State is one of those so concerned. He has come to Washington at the invitation of the committee to discuss this very important matter. I am privileged to present to you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee, Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey.

**John Foster Dulles**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**OF**

**HON. PAUL B. DAGUE**

**OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, April 16, 1959*

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there is not an American today with concern for our relationships on the international scene who has not experienced a numbing shock as he hears the word that our top diplomat, and one of the greatest international figures of the generation, has been immobilized by a malignant disease.

The tears which our President could barely restrain fill the eyes of all of us who have been unwavering in our support of our great Secretary of State, and as he bows to the inevitability of his Maker's decree our sense of irreparable loss is well nigh overwhelming.

In every public address which I have delivered during the last 4 years I have underscored as heavily as I know how our dependence on this great and dedicated American. And I paid special tribute to his philosophy of "going to the brink" as the only practical summation of the principles of a sound foreign policy that have been enunciated since Theodore Roosevelt's admonition as regards "carrying a big stick."

John Foster Dulles—diplomat, statesman, churchman—a soldier battling in the cold war who has been stricken on the field of battle. Here is a compatriot whose place in the Hall of Heroes is assured and whose place in the hearts of his countrymen will be kept forever warm by an affectionate admiration. May Almighty God in His boundless mercy put His healing hand on our brother and ease his hurt. And may He give us strength to carry on in the spirit of this patriotic American.



**The U.S. Army Field Band of  
Washington, D.C.**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there are many facets to the conduct of our foreign relations, and by no means the least of these is the remarkable manner in which the serviceman overseas represents his country as a citizen-ambassador. Similarly, the commendable efforts abroad, as well as at home, of the superb musical organizations of the Armed Forces is worthy of comment. One such fine group is the United States Army Field Band, commanded and directed by Maj. Chester E. Whiting, who formerly presided over instrumental music in the public schools of Malden, Mass., and a man whom I am proud to call a friend. All the citizens of Malden, which comprises a part of my congressional district, are proud of Major Whiting. Major Whiting and his talented and disciplined bandmen have extended the friendly hand of American culture and tradition to eager multitudes throughout the world.

Considered by music critics to be one of the most proficient and distinctive musical organizations now appearing before the public, this band has traveled more than a million miles in recent years and is internationally famous as "The Kings of the Highway."

The Army's most-traveled band is composed of more than 100 of the finest musicians in the Army. Several are bandmasters themselves, and a number have played with leading symphonies. More than a dozen have been with the band since it was organized.

The Army Field Band was organized as the Army Ground Forces Band in March 1946, by Major Whiting, commanding officer and conductor since then. Capt. Robert L. Bierly, a native of Clearfield, Pa., has been executive officer and assistant conductor for almost as long. He is a graduate of Ithaca College, New York, and was director of music in Lynchburg, Va., at one time.

The Soldiers Chorus of approximately 30 bandmen-vocalists is featured on every program. Formed with a nucleus of six musicians in 1947, the chorus is now rated as one of the best male voice groups on the concert stage.

Specialist 7 Eugene W. Coughlin directs the Soldiers Chorus, and is also the band's principal baritone soloist. Before entering military service Coughlin performed with organizations in the Los Angeles, Hollywood and San Francisco Bay areas. He majored in music at Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn., and completed study at the Los Angeles Conservatory of Music.

Paul V. Henry, member of a family long prominent in music circles in New England, is narrator of the U.S. Army

Field Band, and is the possessor of a rich baritone voice, well known to millions of concert goers in all 48 States as well as Mexico, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Europe. A native of Malden, Mass., his musical career began as a violin prodigy.

The Army Field Band has criss-crossed the United States each year for the past decade. Concerts have been given in small communities as well as in major cities, bringing the world's great music to audiences in areas never before visited by famous bands. On tour more than 6 months each year, the soldier-bandsmen have appeared in all 48 States as well as in Canada and Mexico.

The band has also made three extensive overseas tours, sponsored by the Department of the Army and the State Department, where, official reports indicate, the Army bandsmen made an important contribution to President Eisenhower's people-to-people program to foster better international good will.

Praised by high Government officials as "America's musical ambassadors," the Army musicians went overseas for the first time in the late summer of 1952. Eight countries in Europe and the United Kingdom were on the itinerary. Major concerts in Great Britain were given at the opening of the Edinburgh music festival, in Royal Festival Hall in London and in Shakespeare Memorial Park at Stratford-on-Avon. In Europe the band performed in the concert hall in Amsterdam, the Luxembourg Gardens in Paris, and the Olympic Stadium in Berlin.

Spanish bull rings, French provincial market halls, Riviera seaside parks, and Scandinavian amphitheaters were crowded with audiences totaling an estimated 350,000 during the 12,000-mile good will tour of Europe in the spring and summer of 1957. Traversing the Continent from Oslo to Seville and from Lisbon to Belgrade, "The Kings of the Highway" played 43 concerts in 12 countries.

It was the first full-strength U.S. service band ever to appear in Yugoslavia, Portugal, Norway, Monaco, and Denmark, and the first to play in Spain since 1929. Highlights of the tour were an audience with Pope Pius XII, a concert at the royal palace for Prince Rainier and Princess Grace of Monaco, and a special performance for the officers and men of Tito's army in Belgrade.

During the spring of 1958, the U.S. Army Field Band made its first tour of Hawaii and the Far East, the first all-airborne trip since it was organized in 1946. The field band played a total of 45 concerts in 41 days.

The 7-week tour opened in Honolulu in May and ended there in mid-June, with 11 concerts presented in the Territory en route to and from the Orient.

During the 27-day tour of Japan, Korea, and Okinawa, the band played in 34 concerts before an estimated total audience of 150,000. In addition, it was reported that upward of 4 million viewed a concert televised nationwide by Station HNK, Tokyo. The next day, in Yokohama, the band received the first standing ovation ever given a visiting

musical organization, according to city officials. Following concerts at Camp Zama, the bandsmen were airlifted to Korea.

Nearly 50,000 were entertained by the band at two concerts in Seoul. President Syngman Rhee and Mrs. Rhee as well as Korean Government officials were guests. Performances were also given in Pusan, Inchon, Tongduchon, and Munsan, the last two for U.S. and U.N. troops.

Six concerts in 4 days were played in Okinawa, including performances at the Stillwell Field House and the University of Ryukyus.

Returning to Japan, concerts were presented in Fukuoka, Yawata, Hiroshima, Tokyo, and Nikko. The largest indoor concert crowd of the tour, more than 13,500, attended the Nikko concert and 12,000 had heard an indoor performance in Tokyo the previous day.

The band's repertoire ranges from classical arrangements to popular tunes and novelty numbers, including a drum act which has been praised by professional jugglers as well as musicians. Vocal and instrumental solos are part of all performances. Each program is opened and closed with military marches.

The Army Field Band normally travels in a 10-vehicle motor convoy made up of four large buses, four heavy trucks and two sedans, all painted infantry blue. All equipment needed for a concert is carried and the bandsmen can set up and be ready to play within 30 minutes after arrival at a site.

The Army dress uniforms are worn for all major concerts—blue for fall and winter performances and tropical worsted for spring and summer engagements. Music critics have commented on the crisp appearance of the musicians as "befitting the perfection of the performance."

The primary mission of the Army Field Band is to tour, as directed by the Secretary of the Army, and to present free public concerts as the representative band of the Army, both in the United States and abroad. In carrying out its assignment, Major Whiting estimates the band has entertained approximately 10 million persons, including radio and television audiences, in the past decade.

Major Whiting was assigned by the Army to form the band in 1945, and has been commanding officer and conductor continuously since then. Each member is a top-caliber musician, handpicked by Major Whiting personally.

As a result of the band's outstanding performance, he is recognized as one of the most distinguished conductors in the Armed Forces.

Major Whiting studied at the New England Conservatory of Music, in his home city of Boston, and for more than 35 years has been organizing and conducting Army bands.

In 1923 he was appointed a warrant officer bandmaster by the Governor of Massachusetts to organize and conduct the 110th Cavalry Band of the National Guard. The last mounted band in the Army, it was called into Federal service before this country entered World War

II. Redesignated the 180th Field Artillery Band, it was en route to the South Pacific theater when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

Under Major Whiting's leadership, the bandsmen served in the lines during the battle of Guadalcanal. He then reorganized units into the American Division Band, and took part in operations on other islands. The major served almost 3 years in the South Pacific, and was awarded the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star Medal.

In the fall of 1944, the Army assigned him to organize and conduct the first combat infantry band. Composed of musicians, who were also combat infantrymen, it toured the Nation during war-bond drives and was known as "The Million Dollar Band." Musicians from this and other wartime bands formed the nucleus of the U.S. Army Ground Forces Band, organized by the major in 1946. This was redesignated the U.S. Army Field Band in 1950.

Major Whiting is well known as a versatile composer of both military march music and popular tunes. The excellence of his concert arrangements has won the band a featured spot at a number of national band clinics. In 1956, the band was awarded the Midwest National Band Clinic's bronze plaque for "music which has been an inspiration to soldier and civilian alike."

The conductor is a member of the American Bandmasters' Association and an honorary member of Phi Beta Mu, national music fraternity. He is the second conductor to be named an honorary lifetime leader of the Zembo Temple Shrine band of Washington, D.C. This distinction is shared with John Philip Sousa. The major is also the only U.S. Army Band director to appear as guest conductor of the famous Garde Republicaine Band of France.

### Corrupting a Nation Through Newsstands and Mail

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the problems of Congress and the executive department become more acute, more complex with each passing year. Today we are confronted with the growing Communist menace, a domestic economy afflicted with persistent unemployment, the conquest of space, radioactive fallout, and a host of other matters that can never be resolved without the assistance of a most sympathetic Providence. We must have God's help in attacking our Nation's difficulties, but we cannot expect it if we overlook considerations that should be as important to us as they are to Him.

One of our responsibilities is to make the laws needed to uphold the highest moral standards, and a vital step in that

direction was made last year with the enactment of legislation designed to curb distribution of obscene literature. Law-enforcement agencies, religious leaders, and social agencies have long ago established that indecent literature is a prime influence in the corruption of adolescent character; that it leads to bestiality, perversion, and narcotic addiction. Even in the absence of professional scrutiny and statistical analysis, however, social consequences of permitting lewd photographs and printed materials to be obtainable by juveniles are apparent enough to alarm the most apathetic citizen. Whether, in fact, objectionable items of this kind are distributed for an audience that is either young or old is disgusting enough to rouse every respectable man and woman to take action against the practice.

The bill which we passed to counteract distribution of obscene literature was recently commended by the Catholic Standard, published in the Archdiocese of Washington, which observed that the "New, tougher mail indecency law is working." The newspaper pointed out that a California man and his wife has each been sentenced to 10 years in prison in the first legal action under the law. The couple was charged with sending obscene material from points in California and Oregon to Idaho. Under the new law they were arrested in California on a warrant issued by the U.S. attorney at Boise, Idaho, who previously could have taken no action against the offenders.

This development is most encouraging, yet we obviously have a long way to go to clean up our mails and newsstands. The House has directed its committee to explore the situation as it now exists, and further legislation may be found necessary. The Department of Justice has advised parents and other responsible citizens to get in touch with either the local postmaster or the local FBI agents when suggestive material is found to be entering a locality. Unfortunately, there has been some reluctance on the part of individuals to report such activity, an attitude that has precluded prosecutions similar to the California-Idaho case.

It is my pleasure to report that Johnstown Post 90, Amvets, is intensifying a crusade aimed to cleanup reading material on local newsstands. These fighting Americans have no fear of any attempts at retaliation on the part of offenders, and they intend to make reading material safe for youngsters regardless of the tactics of the depraved newsstand operators who for personal gain are willing to corrupt their own neighbor's children. I would suggest that anyone who hesitates reporting a violation of the Federal law on obscene literature to the postmaster or to the FBI merely get in touch with Commander Tom Muldoon. You can be sure that you will get the action that is needed.

The Amvets are to be congratulated on this new patriotic activity. Their example, followed in other communities, can go a long way in wiping out one of the most vicious merchandizing abuses to which a nation can be exposed.

### Bill To Exempt All Members of the Armed Forces From the Tax on Transportation of Persons

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 6411 which would exempt all members of the Armed Forces from the tax on transportation of persons. This bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the discrimination which now exists against the serviceman on furlough who desires to go home by air.

In its present form section 4263(e) of the Internal Revenue Code provides an exemption from the transportation tax for furlough travel by servicemen in uniform provided that the fare paid for such travel is not more than 2.5 cents per mile. This limitation denies servicemen the use of air travel, tax free, since airline fares are higher than 2.5 cents per mile.

There are approximately 1,600,000 servicemen stationed in the United States and the average serviceman is stationed approximately 860 miles from home. These servicemen made, during 1957, approximately 1,200,000 trips home on official leave, furlough or pass. Of this total only 450,000 of such trips were made by air. In view of the substantial distance that the average serviceman is from home, it is obvious that more servicemen would travel by air to their homes were it not for the fact that if they did so they would have to pay not only the higher fare charged by the airlines, but also the transportation tax as well. It is estimated that the average tax payment on furlough and pass travel amounts to about \$8 on the round trip. In view of the limited finances of servicemen this is a serious deterrent to their use of air travel.

Since military furloughs and official leaves are frequently of short duration, to require them to travel only by ground transportation, if they are to receive tax exemption, in many cases prevents them from spending their furloughs at home. This is certainly contrary to the public interest and an unwarranted discrimination against servicemen. Many of the men in military service are away from home for the first time. Certainly everything should be done to enable them to return to their homes and spend their furlough time with their families wherever possible. My bill would accomplish this result. It does not involve a substantial amount of revenue. On the basis of the data released by the Department of Defense and studies conducted by the Air Transport Association the total revenue loss which would result from deleting from section 4263(e) of the Internal Revenue Code the 2.5 cents per mile limitation would be approximately \$4 million.



Hon. John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles brings to an end the remarkable public career of a man dedicated to the service of his country, who, because of unusual ability and strength of character, has made an imprint on the pages of our history that will last for all time. His service in the administrations of both political parties is a clear indication of the esteem in which he was held by those in high positions. The citizens of our great Nation will forever be in his debt for his many and positive achievements in our behalf.

A Special Tribute to the Idlers and the U.S. Army Band for Their Wonderful Contribution to the Joint Session of Congress, February 12, 1959, Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since the joint session of Congress on February 12, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, I have heard much praise for the quality of the musical portion of that program which did much to establish the proper mood for this historic occasion.

It is in order, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, to better acquaint you with the artists who performed on that memorable occasion.

Most of us are familiar with the U.S. Army Band. Units of this outstanding organization appear regularly at functions of this type. Their contribution to the joint session was another one of their fine performances under Maj. Hugh Curry. The choice of selections: "Adoration," "Spirit of Independence," "Man of the Hour," and "All-American Soldier" was most appropriate. I commend them for this wonderful music.

Few of us, however, know much about the choral group, the Idlers, so I would like to make a few facts known about these young men.

The vocal portion of the joint session was presented under the supervision of Bandmaster Donald L. Janse, who led the choral program by the 21-member Idlers, as they are most familiarly known.

They are cadets at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn. Their program, as you know, included a medley

of Civil War songs and a special rendition of the Gettysburg Address. Peter M. Thall of New London composed the selection of the Gettysburg Address as it was set to music. He was 11 years of age at the time he began the composition.

As performed, it was not pretentious music; however, the solemnity and character of the text had been respected from its musical conception. The setting began with a short canon, which simply stated in all voices, the opening phrase of "Taps." The rendition of other Civil War songs gave additional meaning to the entire ceremony. The Idlers have also appeared on radio and television shows and plans are being made for their renditions to be broadcast this year over Radio Free-Europe as a contribution to the Lincoln Sesquicentennial. Also, a musical program similar to that presented at the joint session was given on the occasion of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Sabbath program at the Lincoln Museum—Old Ford's Theater—on Monday, February 15, 1959.

Kentucky's No. 1 City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, for the third consecutive year Franklin, Ky., is the recipient of the annual Kentucky Chamber of Commerce award for civic improvement. Presentation of this award is contingent upon two factors: The winning city must have enhanced its desirability as a place in which to live as well as become more attractive to industry and business.

The friendly city is richly deserving of this honor. Its physical accomplishments during the past year include a new junior high school building, the opening of two industrial plants, Potter & Brumfield and Kendall Polyken, the development of five residential subdivisions, and numerous stores.

In addition, the residents of Simpson County have manifested their understanding of community spirit by exceeding the goal of the United Givers Fund by \$2,000 and by approving an alltime record budget for the schools.

The various civic clubs, elected officials, chamber of commerce, Franklin favorite, radio station WFKN, and the Franklin Industrial Board have been instrumental in bringing these accomplishments to pass. These organizations set their course 4 years ago, and they have not deviated from their original goal. And as in all great achievements, the women have proved themselves indispensable. In behalf of the Business and Professional Women's Club, Miss Rowena Sullivan, president, accepted the honor and accompanying check for \$1,000.

The primary motivation, the incentive which has inspired the residents of Franklin and Simpson County is not so

much the desire to improve the financial standing of the county as to enhance its cultural values and make Franklin a more interesting place in which to live. The retention of her young people, especially the well educated, had become a problem of the first magnitude. In the beginning, a small group of men undertook consideration of this dilemma, but reaction to this movement was favorable, and in short time the project was community property.

Franklin, in most respects, is not unlike many other small towns in Kentucky. But her people possess an invaluable and unmeasurable commodity. They have great pride in their community, and their ambition will not tolerate anything else than the very best for Simpson County.

Mr. Speaker, being recognized as the No. 1 city in Kentucky for 3 successive years is an admirable feat. I feel deeply privileged that I am able to represent Simpson County in the Congress of the United States, and I know that her residents will work to continue Franklin's unparalleled successes.

Planning for Tomorrow's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 11, the Woman's Democratic Club of Norfolk held its annual Jefferson-Jackson Day luncheon. The members and guests of the club were greatly honored by the presence of our charming and able colleague the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], who addressed the meeting.

Mrs. SULLIVAN's remarks were not only appropriate to the occasion, but extremely timely, interesting, and thought provoking. I commend the reading of them to my colleagues:

SPEECH MADE BY THE HONORABLE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON LUNCHEON GIVEN BY THE WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF NORFOLK, VA., APRIL 11, 1959

I do not guarantee that the talk you are about to hear will be anything unusual or special, although, of course, I will try to make it interesting if I can—but I cannot guarantee it will be special. On the other hand, the circumstances of my speaking here are a bit special, and you might be interested to know what makes them so.

First of all, I make it a standing rule not to accept speaking invitations of this nature so far removed from my own home district in Missouri. It is not that I am opposed to speaking outside of my district—or outside the House of Representatives. I enjoy occasions of this kind, joining with fellow citizens from other sections of the country to celebrate our mutual admiration for the Democratic Party. But the invitations cascade down upon us in such volume that it is impossible to accept them all and thus the better part of wisdom is to attempt as gracefully as possible to regret them all. And, frankly, my working schedule is so

heavy that I almost have no choice in the matter.

In the 7 years I have been in the Congress I could probably count on one hand the number of such appearances I have made outside my district at other than Democratic national conventions or regional Democratic affairs, including Missouri.

As to this particular weekend, my being here is special in another way: I just returned to Washington a few days ago after 2 weeks in St. Louis. Naturally, I found my desk piled high with urgent problems—including things I could not have worked on while I was in St. Louis even if they had been mailed to me, and other things which I would have worked on in St. Louis except that they arose after it was too late for my office to get them to me by mail. In other words, even though the congressional recess was by no means a vacation—far from it—I returned to Washington to find as many pending problems there for me as if I had been on vacation. You all know what a vacation does to your work schedule—it ruins it. And in my case I'm having all of the headaches of coming back from a vacation without having had the vacation.

Much of that mass of stuff which was smirking up at me from my heaped-up desk is still there and what I have cleared out and taken care of in these last 3 days has more than been replaced by new crises and problems and assignments and urgent pleas of one kind or another. I represent a problem district, you see. Everyone seems to have problems, and most of them seem to think I have a magic wand to solve them all.

All of this is to say that under normal circumstances I would not normally consider coming down to Norfolk, and under the abnormal circumstances of the moment, with such a deskload of postrecess headaches facing me in Washington, I could not possibly consider coming here.

There are two explanations for the special circumstances of my being here, then. One is the high regard in which all of us in the House of Representatives hold our outstanding Congressman, PORTER HARDY—he is one of the most highly respected and effective Members of the House—and one of the most persuasive, too. And when he made a particular point of urging me to attend your Jefferson-Jackson luncheon, I found it extremely difficult to insist it was impossible for me to come. That was reason No. 1.

The other reason involves an even more illustrious Virginian—yes, even more illustrious than PORTER HARDY. I refer to your Thomas Jefferson, whom you join in honoring today along with the man I think of as the Harry Truman of the 1820's, Andy Jackson. I am sure Andy would be pleased if he were alive today to be likened to Harry Truman of my own State of Missouri in attitude and outlook and fierce devotion to the public good, and I know I couldn't say anything more flattering to Mr. Truman than to tell him I had compared him to his own idol of democracy, Jackson.

But Thomas Jefferson is particularly meaningful to us in St. Louis because, frankly, we owe our existence as Americans to him. Your ancestors here in the East fought for your freedom and they had a lot of help from ancestors of present-day midwesterners fighting alongside them. But, unless Jefferson had shown the kind of imagination and boldness we want and expect in our Chief Executives, there is no telling what flag would be flying today over St. Louis, and the whole vast area west of the Mississippi River.

In our most valuable downtown area bordering the Mississippi in what will be our most spectacular river vista—we in St. Louis, with the cooperation of the National Park Service, are building a dramatic memorial to Thomas Jefferson and to the territorial expansion of the United States accomplished through his Louisiana Purchase. This spec-

tacular river park, overlooking the Father of Waters, near the point where Lewis and Clark began their heroic trek through the wilderness vastness, will be one of the truly impressive scenes of our Nation's many breathtaking views when present plans for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial are completed in 1964, on the 150th anniversary of United States acquisition of the land. Dominating the park will be a huge stainless-steel arch designed by the world-famous architect Saarinen, symbolizing the role of my city as the entrance way to the west, an arc matching in concept the splendor of an America stretching majestically from sea to sea.

We are understandably proud of this joint Federal-local parks program in St. Louis; we are proud to dedicate it to the memory of one of our greatest of all Americans, your fellow Virginian, Thomas Jefferson. For we, too, also revere him. And I feel that in coming to Norfolk to participate in a good Democratic celebration of Jefferson's 216th birthday 2 days early—I think I'm right in my arithmetic that it's 216 years as of next Sunday when Jefferson was born—in any event, in coming into Virginia to talk Democratic politics to Democratic women I feel I am making an appropriate pilgrimage for a St. Louisan.

These, then, are some of the reasons why I have set aside my usual practice and have accepted your warm invitation to come here today. And, now that I am here, I am glad the circumstances were special enough to get me here. For I am enjoying my visit tremendously.

The reference I made a few moments ago to Jefferson's action in acquiring for the United States the vast territories west of the Mississippi is as good a point of reference as any to contrast the difference between political philosophies as represented by our two great political parties.

I understand that here in this area of Virginia the Republican Party is not unknown—although I am sure it is quite ineffective—but at least you do see an occasional Republican and you do have to contend with Republican arguments and Republican propaganda in your campaigns. Therefore, I know you will agree out of personal experience in politics that there are differences—and major ones—between the parties.

Undoubtedly, Jefferson's courage in committing the infant American Republic to an expenditure of such magnitude as \$15 million—in a day when a million meant far, far more than billions mean today—was one of the great political decisions of our entire history. I can think of one or two Republican Presidents who might, in similar circumstances, have made a similar decision—but no Republican President that we have known in our time, certainly. How long can a great political party continue to go along without, at least once in 50 years, coming forward with a single political leader to match the political skill and courage of a Teddy Roosevelt? And poor Teddy, as you recall, finally had to give up on the Republican Party himself and start his own third party nearly a half-century ago. Since his day as Chief Executive, the Republicans have elected a number of Presidents—but not a single one of them has made a single dramatic decision of such far-reaching significance to America's future and the world's advancement as almost every Democratic President, at some time in his administration, has made at least once.

Going back—not to ancient history, but to the recent past—we have the examples on the one hand of a Truman galvanizing a disorganized and fearful world into a solid stand against Communist expansion which saved first, Greece and Turkey, and then all of free Europe, and served notice that freedom would not be bargained away or sur-

rendered. No political project in all history has been of more significance than the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan—the latter conceived by your illustrious Virginia soldier-statesman and put into effect by a courageous President from my State.

Think of the Roosevelt years—of the great decisions—bold, dramatic, incomparable in imagination and in effectiveness. Tomorrow it will be 14 years since Franklin Delano Roosevelt laid down his life for his country and for freedom. As long as any of us shall live who remember that day and that era, we will mourn for and revere him—and feel fortunate in our hearts that we had the privilege to be Americans at a time when his inspiring leadership restored our faith in our country, in our economic system, and, most important, in ourselves.

Woodrow Wilson's widow still lives and thus reminds us—in her occasional participation in Washington in ceremonial or social events—of the Democratic Party's saint-like political philosopher of 1913–20, also a Virginian, who breathed new life into Jeffersonian concepts and who dreamed the dream and saw the vision which today guides free nations everywhere in the pursuit of a secure world in which free peoples can live with their conscience and, yet, with each other.

On the other hand, we have had some Republican Presidents, too, in that period since Teddy Roosevelt left office in 1909. We had a Taft, a Harding, a Coolidge, a Hoover, and now Mr. Eisenhower. Except for the sorry choice out of the smoke-filled room of the Republican Convention of 1920, when Harding was selected, these men have all been regarded as conscientious Presidents, if perhaps inept in the demanding role of the Presidency, that is in the role of leading a dynamic Nation to new greatness.

As Republicans, these men regarded themselves as Presidents in the classic Republican mold of conservatives. And that's all right. But they—including Mr. Eisenhower, practiced their conservatism in the role of conservators—that is, to try to hold tight not only to that of the past which is good but to the status quo, to change nothing, to cling to the past no matter how moth eaten, to trod no new paths or pioneer no new concepts in government.

There are times when the American people think they need that kind of President as a sort of breathing spell from dynamic, dramatic, imaginative government. And of course 1952 and 1956 reflected the yearning for calm, for complacency, after the stress and noisy clashing of the political battles of 20 years and the horror of war.

Consequently, for 6 years we have had a don't rock the boat, don't do anything new, don't worry, don't experiment kind of National Government, and we have stagnated. The American people have now had enough of it—and have repeatedly said so—the most dramatic reiteration coming last November in that simply incredible Democratic sweep. And next year, well, the die is cast.

I have mentioned the Louisiana Purchase several times. Let me ask this—and I believe it is a fair question. Can you imagine our present Republican President and his present and former stand-pat advisers having the decision Jefferson made? I can just imagine the discussion which would have gone on in an Eisenhower Cabinet of 1803.

Mr. Benson would have said that we already had all the farmland we needed on this side of the Mississippi, much of it wild and uninhabited. Who could possibly eat the food grown in the new territories? Mr. HUMPHREY would have said it cost too much to buy the millions of acres of land and would cause inflation which would curl everybody's hair. Mrs. Hobby would have said that the whole idea was just socialism—and who could possibly foresee the use of any such vast territories as the Louisiana



Purchase? We remember her as the lady who could not foresee the almost hysterical demand for Salk vaccine—although now that we have all of it we need, there are still mothers in this country who expose healthy little children to a crippling future by neglect in getting their children inoculated. This is criminal negligence, and a public whipping would hardly be overly severe punishment for any mother who neglects this important duty of protecting her children against polio.

But I digress—I didn't mean to go off on that tangent. But the original fiasco of vaccine distribution under Mrs. Hobby, plus the criminal negligence of those mothers who do not today take advantage of the present availability of the vaccine make me boil in indignation each time I think of it—and nothing reminds me of it so much as mention of the name of our first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. A woman in politics should bring to political life the warmth and humanity which are the greatest contribution to political thinking and governmental affairs that women can make.

In any event, to go back to 1803, I think you will agree with me that if the Eisenhower administration had been in office at the time and had been faced with the decision which confronted Thomas Jefferson, there would have been no Louisiana Purchase. This thought might cause you to lose little sleep, but to us in St. Louis, believe me, the idea is quite intolerable.

Seriously, though, the analogy is politically important, I believe. Under Republican administrations, as we have known them in our lifetimes, our country has been led always on a policy of drift—avoiding hard decisions—floating on a tide of circumstances which seem inevitably to have resulted in economic hardship verging 30 years ago on national bankruptcy. Even today, with so many enthusiastic statistics pouring out of the White House and Commerce Department on production, profits of big corporations, declining unemployment, and so on, the fact remains that we are still deep in an unemployment recession, and the outlook for millions of Americans—particularly for middle-aged workers and for those approaching retirement age—is so grim as to be alarming.

Yet Mr. Eisenhower announces he is very happy over a slightly more than seasonal decline in unemployment, while more than 4 million remain on the unemployment list. And we are told that by October, the number of unemployed might even be down to around 3 million. That is put forward as a statistic to cheer. Actually, it is one to fear.

For we are now turning out everything people want and can afford to buy. We are producing in abundance. Which member of the Eisenhower administration was it who commented during the 1954 recession that freedom is also the right not to have a job—you know, take the bad with the good, keep a stiff-upper-lip and so on. This is Republican dogma, as long as it affects somebody else.

No Democratic administration worthy of the political party label would stand by as complacently and idly as this one is doing in the face of a serious national crisis in employment and in purchasing power.

This Congress, believe me, is not going to accept such supercilious complacency from an administration charged with governing for the good of all Americans.

Congress, under our system, cannot administer national affairs. We cannot name any of the Cabinet officials or administrators; we cannot force the President to do much of anything if he refuses to see the need or act on it. We can provide the tools, we can provide the funds. We can point to the need. We can alert the public to the danger. We can even hobble the administration to keep it from doing terribly wrong things—if we

hear about them soon enough. But we cannot as a Congress force affirmative action.

But as a people, we can—all of us insisting on action and making our voices heard. And that must be the role of every forward-looking American—particularly all of us who regard ourselves as Democrats—more particularly all of us who pride ourselves on being Democratic women.

Be a Patricia Henry—and demand that our leaders meet our problems head on. Old Patrick called for liberty; you, his descendants, must call for leadership from a weary and unimaginative national administration.

Mr. Eisenhower could easily find good administrators who can do the job if he wants it done. We have plenty of experienced Democrats who served magnificently in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations who could, with Ike's backing, get our economy off dead center—get Norfolk booming again—and St. Louis—and restore America's greatness and promise.

Mr. Eisenhower has only a little over a year-and-a-half to get things back into shape—or at least to get a good start on restoring real prosperity and confidence to the American economy—before the job will no longer be his.

After that, the problem will be ours. Whether it is handled by an Adlai Stevenson, or a Hubert Humphrey, or a Jack Kennedy, or a Pat Brown, or a Missourian I think a whole lot of, named Stuart Symington—or whoever our nominee is next year—I think I can assure you good Democrats of this fact:

The problems he faces will be met forthrightly and courageously—whatever they are. They will be tackled as a challenge to devise effective solutions, not to merely avoid rocking the boat.

The boat has been rocking—violently at times—in these past 6 years, largely because of the reluctance of the helmsman and the rest of the crew to head into the deep waves and plough through them.

What might have been mere swells on our economic sea have done us irreparable harm year after year because our national administration tried more to avoid them than to overcome them.

Let us look our national problems straight in the eye, whatever they are, size them up, analyze them, and overcome them. Only in that direction lies the progress we seek for our country, and for the free world.

Our party has always—since the days Thomas Jefferson conceived of it and gave it meaning—our party has always stood upright and unafraid against any challenge to America's progress. Our leaders have neither panicked in the face of nor hidden from, challenge. It's true that we do a lot of fighting among ourselves, we Democrats, and for what we often consider good cause. But when it comes to facing unafraid the challenge of tomorrow, we unite and close ranks and move ahead full speed into the thickets of the political fray.

Progress can come to America only in proportion to the willingness of our national leaders to stick their necks out for principle. Jefferson was maligned, abused, despised by the standpatters of his day. Jackson's name was anathema to the same group. Roosevelt was "That man in the White House"—a term spoken with venom and hate. Truman was ridiculed, as no national figure in our time has ever been depreciated and laughed at.

Our next president—whichever Democrat he may be—probably faces similar abuse such as was heaped on the men I have mentioned. That is because he will—whoever he is—if he is a true Democrat, insist on planning for tomorrow's needs rather than yesterday's.

Supported by people like you—by Democrats who want our country to continue to grow and not stagnate—the next president, whichever Democrat he may be out of our

abundance of outstanding candidates—will have the opportunity to be a great president.

For that's the only kind we Democrats are used to.

## Maine Will Be Host to First International Medical Conference on Mental Retardation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. FRANK M. COFFIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a conference of worldwide importance to be held at Portland, Maine, from July 27 through July 31, 1959. The First International Medical Conference on Mental Retardation will take place during those 5 days and I take deep pride in the fact that leaders in the field of medicine and welfare in the State of Maine have initiated, organized and sponsored this significant meeting which is the first of its kind. I believe it is worthy of the widest possible attention.

Although I have no expert knowledge in this field, I am informed that within the last few years various important conclusions have been reached through research and informal observations of retarded children. The primary objective of the conference is to focus attention on problems that can be attacked scientifically. The participants will be eminent physicians from various parts of the United States, Canada, and Europe. The sponsoring committee, recognizing that the challenge surmounts international differences, is attempting also through proper channels to extend invitations to physicians beyond the Iron Curtain.

Those who are interested in this forthcoming conference may request information from the conference secretary, division of maternal and child health, Statehouse, Augusta, Maine. It is being organized by the Maine chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Pineland Hospital and Training Center, Pownal, Maine; the division of maternal and child health, State department of health and welfare, and the Maine Medical Association.

Peter W. Bowman, M.D., Pownal, Maine is serving as general chairman of the conference. Edmund N. Ervin, M.D., Waterville, is chairman of the liaison committee. He is assisted by C. E. Benda, M.D., Arlington, Mass.; George Stevenson, M.D., New York, N.Y.; J. Rees, M.D., London, England; P. Plum, M.D., Copenhagen, Denmark; G. Frontali, M.D., Rome, Italy; Richard Maseland, M.D., Bethesda, Md. Ella Langer, M.D., Augusta, Maine, is chairman of arrangements and finance.

The program committee, of which Hans V. Mautner, M.D., Pownal, Maine is chairman, comprises Malcolm J. Farrell, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Howard V. Bair, M.D., Parsons, Kans., and Ella Langer, M.D., Augusta, Maine.

# The Republic at the Crossroads

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1959, Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, made a speech in Webster Groves, Mo., "The Republic at the Crossroads." I wish to call his remarks to the attention of my colleagues and they are as follows:

#### THE REPUBLIC AT THE CROSSROADS

Those present are joined by many not present as I nostalgically review the past which this occasion prompts. This is a wonderful reunion, after 22 years, 10 months, which for me were chronologically: College 4 years; business 1½ years; military service 4½ years; business (including my own) 9 years; and Congress 4 years, a full and varied experience.

Here, in Webster, I learned my lessons. Here I acquired the foundation for the later experiences. I had wonderful youthful years, thanks to the people, schools, and environment, right here. Oddly, as I grow older this becomes more obvious and meaningful to me.

The thanks I would extend to those here, and those not here, will be through whatever effort I can put forth to justify their training, friendship, and help. Sort of in the father-son spirit, "Make the world a little better because you were there." Humbly, but with firm resolve to say thanks, exemplified perhaps by remembering Lincoln, "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom; that government of, by, and for the people shall not perish from this earth." I didn't think so much of that in Webster High or in war when I sent a combat buddy's gear home to his family. But I thought of it later, and I do now as a public servant, a Federal Representative, as we tonight reunite for a few moments as old friends—but now, not as youths, but as responsible adults with problems and a government on our hands—our hands. It's our government to preserve for those who follow, and in memory of those who went before.

I'm here because of your Congressman TOM CURTIS, not just to permit myself the pleasure of a wonderful reunion. This is not the gratuitous expression so often heard publicly or the flowery protestations on the floor of the House, as a prelude to destructive attack. For me, this is a token of respect for a hard worker, and I think of the Curtis subcommittee's work on the problem of life insurance taxation, which became a factual textbook underlying the study and hearings for this year's tax bill—a pity more didn't study this document. I predict these views, with Tom's additions this year in the minority views, in which we both joined, will be remembered in the future, becoming increasingly influential. Tom's effectiveness can be measured in committee and floorwork by a few simple examples. The reciprocal trade bill of last year in committee and floorwork shows his guiding hand as he reconciled the conflicting views of both parties and the objections of the protectionists. I say this from a most critical viewpoint myself, as a dissenter to parts of the program. More recently, Tom suggested the airport compromise that joined the existing allotment formula and the lower spending figure—in which Democrats and Republicans then joined. In committee such adjustments are often made through Tom's efforts

as in the Mills-Curtis formula for last year's insurance taxation. And I commend Tom for courage—as his championing the facts in the Goldfine issue last year. As many popularly joined the attack like howling wolves, Tom stuck to the facts, reminding the House that regardless of respective sides in the argument, we were violating our own House rules created to prevent character assassination.

Tom's work time and again in the Joint Economic Committee is a guiding force, as in the current study of the 1959 President's Economic Report. It's a pity that the somewhat technical nature of the study of inflation, price stability and maximum employment lacks the glamour and public attention which its importance warrants. You would all enjoy the debate between Tom and several Members on Monday, March 9 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). So you see, my visit is actually not a friendship matter, as such, but a matter of respect for and teamwork with a legislator who has courage, ability, and a dedication to principles, which my remarks tonight will, I hope, further explain.

As a small businessman who knew little of the ins and outs of politics, and as a Republican in an overwhelmingly Democrat area, I ran for public office 5 years ago and made but one political promise—that I would measure each piece of legislation by two yardsticks: (1) Is it a function of the Federal Government? (2) Can we afford it?

I promised I'd vote on each proposal according to whether or not it passed those tests, and letting the political chips fall where they might.

Having tried conscientiously to hew to that line for 4 years, a course described by some as political suicide, I was immensely proud when the people of Dallas County, in the biggest off-year turnout on record, roundly endorsed that attitude toward government by returning me for the third time as their Representative in Washington. But did I win the election?

What wins a given election? No one can ever be entirely sure. The time, effort, and money of many dedicated citizens, political amateurs, many of whom were previously unknown to me, won this particular election.

This much I know, and there is no need to kid ourselves about it. Dallas Countians, like others in the South, for the most part regard themselves as Democrats. But conservatives of both parties effectively united to stand behind an unabashedly conservative record in Congress, and they didn't balk at my own avowed Republicanism.

The Republic is at the crossroad. Whether it is to remain the traditional constitutional Republic in a democracy or become a centralized inflated supergovernment, antithetical to the beliefs of our Founding Fathers, which beliefs we have not countermanded, not really, nor do we intend to, I am convinced.

A democracy is government of, by, and for people. The people participate. A republic is representative government, wherein the people are represented by others of their choosing. A representative, then, represents all the people, but is elected by a majority of the voters. Here's one problem—it is not a majority of the people, over half don't participate.

A second problem implicit in our form of government is the assumption of an "informed electorate," that is, that the voters know the issues and problems confronting the Nation and its Government. To the degree they don't, the Government, as in the case of people not voting, is weakened. Using his judgment, the Representative, then, votes, representing his constituents, as he feels the majority of his constituents would, if in his shoes, facing the particular circumstances and facts. That simply is our form of government and the two problems.

We are at the crossroads because a majority don't vote, and those who vote (as well as the others) don't study the issues and aren't informed. The crossroads point which way we'll go—preserve constitutional government or embrace socialism or another ism.

It is now a question of preserving our Nation and its institutions. This is done through political parties. The parties must have sound principles or fail in this task.

It is to that job we must dedicate our principal effort. For, if we fail in it, there will not be much need to worry about elections. And, if we succeed—by awakening the American people to a recognition of their peril—victory at the polls will follow.

We must bring to our task more than just an urge to take power. A political party enters this fray ill-equipped unless it is armed with basic principles—unchanging beliefs so precious they cannot be sacrificed for any political victory. Without such principles, a political party is nothing more than a gathering of office seekers and their friends. Without principles, a political party, in the words of our President, is only a conspiracy to gain power.

I believe the Republican Party, of the two, is the only possible party now to accomplish this objective, as you will see. To me, this assertion isn't blind party loyalty either, by a long shot, but critical appraisal.

It is true that any party representing a broad cross section of the American people will encounter differences of opinion as to details and method. That is true of our party. In fact, I suggest that we Republicans have permitted these differences to become so magnified in our own minds and the public mind that the principles which unite us have been forgotten or ignored. As a result there has been all too much talk about hyphenated Republicans—liberal-Republicans, conservative-Republicans, modern-Republicans. It is time—if we are to face the challenges that confront us—that we start thinking, talking, and acting as Republicans—period.

Let us heed the words of Lincoln when he said: "I'm afraid of the result upon organized action where great results are in view—if any of us allow ourselves to seek out minor or separate points in which there may be differences of views as to policy and right, and let them keep us from uniting in action upon a great principle in a cause on which we all agree."

Let us remember that our strength can stem only from the basic principles which unite us.

These principles are so deep and instinctive that we have unfortunately too often felt it either unnecessary or too difficult to put them into words. But they must be put into words; they must be enunciated over and over again. Our beliefs and principles must be articulated so clearly and forcefully that there can be no doubt as to where we Republicans stand and why.

Let me presume here tonight to make a modest beginning at putting into words what we so deeply and firmly feel.

We believe, we Republicans, that no generation can live solely for itself but rather that it has the heaviest of obligations to preserve the Nation and its institutions, strengthened and improved, for those who follow. We know that our heritage was won only by the sacrifice of those who preceded us. We have the high moral duty to sacrifice, if need be, to preserve and protect it.

We know, as we face the problems inherent in preserving our society, that the right way is not always the easy way, but that we have no choice except to take the hard way if it is, in truth, the right way. We recognize that we will find ourselves frequently bucking the popular tide, for we know, just as surely as the Democrats, that there is little political appeal in self-denial. If we accept the re-



sponsibility of leadership, however, and that is one of the functions of a political party, we must serve as stern guardians of the national common sense.

We accept, as part of the responsibility of leadership, the duty of making clear to the people that the easy way, if it is wrong, leads only to the misery of retraced steps or the finality of disaster. Championing what we believe to be right may at times lose us political battles; but we are supremely confident it is the only way to a clear conscience and ultimate victory.

We believe in a government of laws which have as a principal aim the prevention of the seizure of dominant power by any man, or group of men.

We believe that the political and economic strength of a nation depend upon the genius of its people and that genius cannot flourish wrapped round with the chains of an all-powerful state or an all-powerful minority.

We believe that liberty is man's most precious possession and that it includes the freedom to have an incentive to produce. This has led to our faith in the soundness of an economic system based upon man's universal urge to better his lot. We believe that success, if it is to be the incentive for all, cannot be mocked and scorned and discouraged in an appeal to the envy of others.

We believe in a limited government as the best means of preserving individual freedom and initiative, but this does not bind us to the legitimate needs of our citizens or the challenges which confront our Nation.

We insist, however, that the needs the Federal Government is called upon to meet be real needs which cannot be met by individual initiative or by the unit of government closest to the people, and particularly, that they are not needs manufactured by those looking for special advantage or power.

We believe that the challenges to our Nation's survival can best be met, not through ill-considered actions based on fear or emotion, but by a nation which itself is guided by basic principles, proceeding confidently because it is physically strong, morally right, and carefully prepared.

It is because of these beliefs, these principles, that the Republican Party is called upon by its own conscience to move vigorously to the task of preserving our Nation against the present-day threats to its survival.

In my book there are today three great threats facing us as a people and as a Nation:

The threat of communism.

The threat of inflation.

The threat of new monopolies.

Each must be met head on. Each must be fought relentlessly if what we call the American way of life is to survive.

The first threat is the most dramatic and the most apparent. It stems from the rapid rise of Soviet military and economic power. We have seen the Soviet Union ruthlessly trample on the rights of its people and other nations in its drive to rule the world. By concentrating on the means to produce military power, it has rapidly industrialized its economy and achieved far-reaching scientific advances, a combination which has made it a real threat to world security. We may deplore their methods, but we ignore, at our own peril, the presence of vast military and economic power in the hands of a small group of men imbued with a fanatic belief in the inevitability of communism's world conquest.

The reaction of the Democrats to the more dramatic evidences of Russian military power has been characteristic. Conditioned from habit, their immediate response has been that we outspend the Russians and achieve victory through sheer weight of the American dollar. Democrat spending bills followed quickly in the orbit of the first Rus-

sian satellite and every new announcement from the Kremlin quickens their flow.

It would indeed be wonderful if all we had to do to preserve our Nation against the Russian military threat was to turn on a spending spigot. It is not that easy, and the political party which tells the American people that it is, is gambling recklessly with the future of our Nation. If, as a nation, we rely solely on scattering our national wealth to the winds in order to quiet every fear, we can lose this fight before we start.

We cannot meet the Russian military challenge by siphoning off and diluting our available resources, both of brains and materials. Yet, the numerous critics of our defense policies insist, when you put all their charges together, that we engage in just such a scatterbrained effort. The net effect of following the advice of a Symington, Johnson, Anderson, Jackson, or any other Senator or Representative who wants more money for a specific defense need, would be weakness through dissipation of our strength. It would be a defense based not on the best estimates of our National Security Council, the entire intelligence resources of the Nation, and the expert advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and our President, but on the worst fears of our most frightened politicians.

What it will take to beat the Russians at this gruesome game is a government and people ready, of course, to sacrifice whatever is needed for our overall superiority, but determined at the same time to proceed only on the basis of sound estimates, rational thinking, and carefully conceived plans which look not just to today but also to tomorrow. This is the hard road, and only a party of principle has the courage to stand up to the fearmongers and tell the American people it is the road we should follow.

It is clear, too, that only a party of principle can furnish the kind of leadership which stands fast against those Democrats who would sacrifice our world position in the face of the potent power of the Soviet Union. When it is all boiled down, the constant carping over the inflexibility of Mr. Dulles, the demands for a new approach to the Soviet Union, and the laments for the lack of viability in our foreign policy are nothing more than a frightened unwillingness to face up to the fact that you can't appease the Russian without losing your shirt in the process. We are confident the American people won't soon again be led down the so-called easy road of appeasement.

The second threat to our security as a nation is the insidious menace of inflation. Our response to inflation is not only significant in its own right but it cannot be divorced from the challenge of the Soviet Union.

No greater test of the principles of the Republican Party can be provided than in the fight against inflation. It cannot be successfully undertaken unless we are willing, as a nation, to think more of the future than of ourselves and to take the hard but right way so that our Nation and its institutions can be preserved.

As we move positively against the threat of inflation, we Republicans are accused of being preoccupied with balanced budgets, of being negative when we oppose unessential spending programs, and of having a narrow bookkeeping attitude toward the problems of our Nation.

I say to you: There can be no more positive programs, for our party or any party, than to try to save this Nation from the disaster which will take place if inflation, through habitual spending beyond our income, becomes the national way of life.

As we oppose programs which individually have vote appeal but which taken together lead swiftly and surely to national bankruptcy, we lay ourselves open, of course, to the demagog's cry. But what we seek is

more important than any single spending program. Unless we can maintain the stability of our currency, we will not have the strength to support any governmental program, no matter how desirable—be it for defense, for scientific advance, or for human welfare. Bound up in the fight for a balanced budget is the question of whether our economy will have the strength and stability to maintain us in the battle for survival.

Let it be remembered that we have been living beyond our income in 23 of the last 28 years. The credit of the U.S. Government is at the breaking point.

It is not just the national budget that is involved in the Democrat spending programs. The personal budget of each and every individual and family is involved. An unbalanced national budget means unbalanced family budgets; it means loss of credit, of earnings and savings, insurance, pensions, and annuities. When unbalanced national budgets and inflation become our national way of life, they all go down the drain together.

There is also a moral issue.

The time has come to end the completely immoral practice of passing on to our children the debts we incur for our own immediate benefit. We could at least have respect for the morality of the spenders if they would suggest that this generation pay, through higher taxes, for the cost of the programs they so glibly propose. They lack the courage for that, and in many cases, like the Senators from my State, they not only beguile the people with vast spending programs but promise simultaneous tax reductions. Let us call a spade a spade. Mortgaging our children's future is basically immoral.

There is the question of equity.

The first obligation of government is to treat its citizens equally. There is no equity when a government spends to provide special benefits for some of its citizens, because they are politically powerful, at the expense of all other citizens. But, the inequity is tragically multiplied when a government must borrow and inflate its currency to do so. For inflation does not strike all citizens an even blow; it hits hardest at the weak, the unorganized, at those who lack the means to protect themselves from its subtle and devastating robbery, the widow living on insurance, the aged living on pensions. No government which pretends to serve all the people can retain their confidence if it promotes wholesale inequity by choosing the easy road of unbalanced budgets.

There is the issue of survival.

I have spoken of the military challenge of Soviet Russia and the kind of response we must make to it. Will we have the sheer physical strength for that challenge—no matter how many missiles are on the launching pads—if our underlying base of a sound fiscal structure and a strong economy are rotted away by inflation?

The answer, of course, is "No," but the Soviet challenge is more than military; it is a total challenge on the military, political, economic, and moral fronts. Can the United States meet that total threat with its currency debased, its credit gone, its economy in turmoil, its citizens divided and its morality compromised, if we adopt inflation as a way of life? Of course not.

Politically, can we hold ourselves up to the nations of the world as a shining alternative to communism if we are unable to keep our own house in order, if we display a fatal political weakness in our form of government by casting aside principle for the fatal charms of expediency? How can we be an example to the world if we cannot in times such as these even meet our current needs out of current income?

Can we meet the Communist economic offensive if through inflation we price our

goods out of the world market and if the American dollar becomes a currency to be shunned rather than desired?

And morally, where does this Nation stand as opposed to immoral communism if it succumbs to the immorality of inflation?

Let no man tell you that those who fight against the unbalanced budgets which cause inflation are preoccupied with the mechanics of bookkeeping. We are preoccupied, but our preoccupation consists of the most urgent and positive program this Nation can undertake—the prevention of a national disaster. It is our job as Republicans, as a party of principle, to awaken the Nation to this clear and present danger.

The President has presented the Nation with a balanced plan for security and public welfare. He has presented a plan balanced as to income and expenditures. It is a truly Republican program. It is our job as Republicans to exert every effort to make this plan a reality.

I mentioned earlier that one of the basic principles of the Republican Party is the belief in a government of laws which have as a principal aim the prevention of the seizure of dominant power by any man or group of men. Because of this principle, the Republican Party is called upon to meet the threat of the new monopolies, powerful labor organizations under the domination of a handful of men.

Under Republican leadership, this Nation met the challenge of the seizure of dominant power by a few industrialists and financiers a generation ago. It curbed the power of the trusts when in the public interest it enacted antimonopoly legislation under Republican leadership.

Today similar power rests in the hands of men who dictate the policies of our national labor unions. It consists of vast economic power, the power to cripple an industry or a nation. It is economic power which has reached out so successfully for political power that it has taken over, for all practical purposes, the Democratic Party and now controls the Congress of the United States. It is a combination of economic and political power which threatens the national interest because it is a power which places its own interest above the interest of all citizens.

Curbing the power of the new monopolies will be infinitely more difficult than dealing with the old industrial and financial monopolies, for the new monopolists have wrapped themselves in the cloak of the so-called common man. They have been careful to inculcate the doctrine that their monopoly interest is identical with the interest, not only of union members, but all working men and women. No attempt can be made to curb the power of the new monopolies without incurring their charge that it is a move against the public interest.

But the public—the consuming public—does not benefit from the exercise of naked monopolistic power to raise wages, and hence prices, beyond the level justified by increased productivity—nor from the extortions of a Hoffa made possible by the power his monopoly gives him.

The public—the union worker public—does not benefit when its dues are stolen, or frittered away, or spent for propaganda or political activity against its wishes.

The public—the taxpaying public—does not benefit when the political power of the new monopolies is used to extract special benefits from a pliant Congress or legislature.

The public—the small-business public—does not benefit when its choice, confronted with the overwhelming power of a giant union, is to accede to its demands or go out of business.

The public—the farm public—does not benefit when the new monopolies drive up farm costs far beyond the ability to increase farm prices.

Nor can the public—all of us as free citizens—benefit when dominant political and economic power rests in the hands of a few men, no matter how much they claim to have our best interests at heart.

Let there be no mistake about it. The evils which have arisen because of the emergence of the new monopolies are the result of the power they hold in their hands. We cannot eliminate the evils until we restore the balance of power and to do so, we must curb the powers of the new monopolies even as we protect the very legitimate rights of working men to organize for their own protection and own welfare.

As a party of principle, we cannot dodge this issue. The Democrats must avoid it at the peril of their extinction as a political force. They are incapable of going beyond what the new monopolies will permit, and this consists only of wiping the smudges off from the faces of those union leaders who have gotten dirtiest in their greed for power. It's up to us to take the lead in a sustained effort to curb this threat to the stability of our Nation. It will in the end earn us the gratitude of the vast majority of the American people who, even now, sense the danger involved in letting unbridled monopoly power run loose in our land.

In these great tasks, then, in meeting the Communist threat, in fighting inflation, in curbing the new monopolies, we Republicans have a job to do. At stake is the future of our Nation and the security and happiness of our people.

There is only one way we can go about this task and that is to devote our every resource to it. We cannot succeed, in the face of an overwhelming Democrat majority in the Congress, unless we arouse the American people to the dangers which confront them and unless we imbue them with a belief in the principles we uphold. We must, through them, make it politically impossible, for any party or group, to lead this Nation down the easy road to its downfall.

We need to make our party an effective political organization. We need to enlist in our ranks the millions who believe, as we do, in the principles we uphold. We need the devotion, discipline and dollars without which a party cannot function. We need to tell our story, clearly, unhesitatingly, forcefully so there is no man in this land who does not know our party's principles, program, and goals. We need, in short, to get down to work.

And as we set upon this noble task of saving a nation, should the path look dim, the goal remote and the obstacles insurmountable, we can do no better than take courage from the faith that: "Right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

### Mandatory Control Program on Residual Oil Imports

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from Down East have recently come some exceedingly vehement denunciations of the White House order creating a mandatory control program on residual oil imports. I think it is about time that our friends in New England pursue a more objective and consistent course in our old international trade program. In the first place, it is difficult to understand how a

region of the United States that has already experienced very critical fuel shortages because of the unreliability of sea traffic in periods of hostility would object to any program designed to guarantee availability of supplies under similar conditions. The President's proclamation issued on March 10 was prompted because oil imports have so enervated domestic fuel industries as to seriously weaken the mobilization base. The President is aware that a fuel which must be transported over ocean lanes infested with enemy submarines could not be depended upon to run a war machine.

Assuming that those New Englanders protesting the White House order, have forgotten events of not too many years back, I should like to place in the RECORD a number of headlines that appeared in our newspapers during the early part of World War II when tankers coming from ports on the Gulf of Mexico were being intercepted both in the gulf and along the Atlantic seaboard. Here are but a few that I have taken from my files: "U-Boat Torpedoes Tanker Off Jersey"; "Tanker Sunk Off Our Atlantic Coast"; "Florida Crowd Sees U-Boat Sink Ship Off Shore"; "Two Tankers Torpedoed—One Off Jersey Witnessed by Thousands in Resort Towns"; "Allied Tanker Seen in Sinking Condition Off Long Island."

There is the story of what can happen on the high seas in wartime. I might also recall for your benefit that at one time an enemy underwater action was responsible for sinking a tanker within a short distance of New Orleans. In addition, at one time three tankers went down in the immediate vicinity of Dutch West Indies, which happens to be the principal source of the residual oil that moves into our east coast markets at the present time.

Now, how was New England affected by the inability to move oil over the water? As late as the spring of 1943, the fuel shortage impaired normal activity up and down coastal areas from Maine to New York. Earlier, the Petroleum Administrator in Washington warned New England to prepare for the worse. This headline from the New York Times explains the situation: "Ickes Says Worse Situation Is Coming and Asks Conversion to Using Coal." The wisdom of this prediction is confirmed in these 1943 headlines: "Hospital Is Ordered Closed by City To Save on Fuel Oil"; "Stillwater Worst Mill Closed by Oil Shortage"; "Eight Rhode Island Textile Plants Forced To Close Today"; "Exodus of Labor Threatens Mills in Fuel Oil Crises"; "Fuel Oil Shortage Here To Close 95 Parochial Schools"; "Oil Shortage Forces Two War Plants To Close."

If further evidence is desired, I am sure that the Library of Congress will be happy to make available complete copies of the newspapers carrying these accounts of horror off the Atlantic coast and the subsequent difficulties in fuel-hungry New England.

The almost total destruction of tanker traffic in the early part of the war was effectuated by a nation whose sea forces included 150 submarines. Today, the Russians have a fleet of some 450 underwater craft. No power in world history



has ever had so large a submarine force. Two-thirds of Russia's submarines are long-range ocean patrol types developed after World War II with the aid of German naval designers.

Adm. James S. Russell, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, in speaking before the Military-Industrial Conference in Chicago recently, included this paragraph in his report on Red naval power:

Quantitatively we may expect the Soviet submarine fleet to remain at about its present level; qualitatively, however, the threat to the free world will continue to grow as the older and smaller submarines are phased out of service and the number of new long-range types increases. These long-range submarines pose a threat not only to our vital traffic across the seas, but to our industrial centers as well, for the Soviets have the capability for arming these submarines with missiles and it must be assumed that some are already equipped.

With this knowledge, Mr. Speaker, can anyone here take issue with the President for his action based on the likelihood that foreign oil would be available in wartime? He knows the vital importance of vigorous domestic coal and oil industries. It was his responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to proclaim the oil import order in behalf of America's mobilization program. I am hopeful that there will be no more contesting a decision made in the interests of national safety.

I also remind my colleagues from New England that there is no justifiable reason for your anticipatory fuel problems. These illusions were created even before the mandatory control plan went into operation. The amount of residual oil to be admitted under Presidential order is the same as was imported in 1957, at that time the highest quantity in history and almost equal to the 1958 figure. Thus the deluge may continue its deplorable economic impact on producing regions of the United States, and I assure you that I shall strive for legislation for a further cutback to a place where imports are in line with the tariff and quota protection afforded industries in other areas. Meanwhile, no one should anticipate any scarcity of fuel supplies under the decree. A considerable number of the east coast plants now on residual oil are equipped to convert to coal, which is available in adequate quantities at reasonable prices. Bituminous coal prices at the mine have remained steady for the past decade, and studies by outstanding industrial economists disclose no tendency toward a sharp upward movement over the long term.

I am, of course, conscious of the fact that residual oil has been available to east coast customers at prices slightly below what they would have to pay for coal. The importing companies have captured coal's traditional markets because they are able to adjust prices without any threat to the corporate structure. The profits from the sale of gasoline and the lighter oils are usually adequate to absorb the production and refining costs, so that residual oil is left over to be sold at whatever price will capture the market.

With all of this foreign residual oil—the more than a billion and a quarter

barrels of it—that entered the United States in the past 10 years, what have the people of our country gained? What benefit has accrued to the populace of any single State or region? Residual oil cannot be used for heating homes, and you would not be driving any more if you tried putting it into the engine of your car. The big plants and generating stations are principal customers of this fuel. Their use of a foreign commodity in preference to a product of America's mines is certainly not inconsistent with the philosophy expressed by their representatives in Congress. Time after time members of the New England delegation have vociferously denounced trade policies that permit imports to impinge upon business conditions in leather goods, textiles, fish, lumber, bicycles, watches, and products of other New England industries.

This factor should be kept in mind when residual oil imports are under consideration. If our coal miners back in Pennsylvania are deprived of a means of livelihood because of a foreign invasion on their markets, where do we get the purchasing power for the goods that New England manufactures and sells? In my estimation it is about time that Members of Congress from the many areas suffering economically from unfair import competition collaborate on our identical problems. I can assure you that I have always concurred in recommendations to adjust international trade policies in such a way as to safeguard industries in New England, the South, and in other regions. I am convinced that we can get together if we consider the matter on a nationwide scale. Each year a growing number of communities is added to the list of industrial centers paralyzed or severely injured through inequitable import competition. The automobile manufacturers, who formerly led the free trade brigade into Washington when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came up for extension, have been noticeably silent in recent times. There is a definite fear that, unless someone puts the brakes on foreign cars entering this country, the big American jobs are going to get run off the road and unemployment around Detroit will be even worse than has been the case during the past year. Even the big office machine manufacturers, who once were proudly in the president's chair of a leading free trade committee, are beginning to wince when they walk into the Pentagon and see the large number of Olivettis and other foreign-produced typewriters and calculators.

The Presidential order restricting residual oil imports is designed to protect the Nation in emergency periods. It is certainly one executive department order to which no one in this country should object, yet restrictions on oil need to be bolstered considerably, and chances are that any help that we Representatives of fuel-producing districts can get will redound to the benefit of the rest of the country. With unemployment persisting on a high scale, I do not think we can afford to pass up the chance to get our people back to work.

## Congressman Boggs Scores Hit in Chicago With Talk on H.R. 5

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a remarkable address by the Honorable HALE BOGGS, our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, at the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference. Congressman Boggs spoke on the subject of "How To Encourage American Investment Abroad" with especial reference to H.R. 5. From the many letters I am receiving from Chicago I would conclude that few speakers have ever impressed a Chicago audience as did the gentleman from Louisiana on that occasion. The following letter is from Walker B. Davis, counsel of the Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.:

The Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. designs, fabricates, and erects large steel plate structures, such as tanks used for the storage of petroleum products at refineries and bulk stations, as well as tanks and other containers for many other industries. We have done a great deal of work in foreign countries. Sometimes we have furnished the fabricated steel, while in other cases we have erected fabricated steel supplied from outside the United States. We are anxious to continue our foreign operations, and also to expand them, but the tax burden imposed by the Government of the United States on the results of such operations puts us at a competitive disadvantage as compared with foreign contractors. Indeed, these considerations may force us to transfer the conduct of such operations to a subsidiary organized in another country.

I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Boggs and listening to him speak on this subject. I think he knows a great deal about it and, of course, I need not tell you what a fine gentleman he is. Perhaps you will be interested in the enclosed copy of the address he delivered at the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference on February 27. I think it is as good a statement as I have seen of the reasons why this bill should, as I believe, be enacted into law.

### Congressman Boggs' address follows: HOW TO ENCOURAGE AMERICAN INVESTMENT ABROAD

(Address by Hon. HALE BOGGS, U.S. Congressman from Louisiana, member, Committee on Ways and Means, at the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference, Palmer House, Chicago, February 26-27, 1959; sponsors: Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and Export Managers Club of Chicago, Inc.)

I was delighted to receive the invitation to address this the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference. I am always glad for an opportunity to come to Chicago. Chicago typifies in so many ways the dynamic industrial, commercial, financial and political leadership which has made America great. I find here so much in common with my own home city of New Orleans. We, too, have problems of slum clearance, rehabilitation of blighted areas, and long-range planning for civic improvements and industrial development. And now Chicago, like New Orleans, is to be a major seaport and center of world trade. As you know, New Orleans is second only to New York in the dollar volume of world trade clearing through its port facilities.

The leadership of the Illinois Congressional Delegation under my esteemed colleague and dear friend on the Committee on Ways and Means, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, is so persuasive that I have supported him on most matters in which you are interested—particularly in his valiant fight for increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

The spirit of friendly competition which may now develop between the new and expanded port facilities in the Chicago area, and other established centers of world commerce in the United States will be beneficial to all. As reflecting this spirit of friendly competition from New Orleans, I should like to remind you that the Port of New Orleans has maintained in Chicago for several years now an executive general agent, Mr. André Mouton, who holds membership both in the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and in the Export Managers Club of Chicago, Inc., the two sponsoring organizations of this World Trade Conference. These two great centers of world commerce, united as they are via the Mississippi River, can provide a firm foundation for the great volume of world trade which I am convinced holds the key to the longer range hopes for peace.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of an expanding volume of world trade to the long range security of the United States and the free world. To me, peace, freedom and world trade are indivisible. World peace hinges on world trade—not a permanent program of foreign aid. And trade can be mutually advantageous over a prolonged period only if all countries have the facilities to produce whatever the combination of their natural resources, the natural capacity of their people, and their available capital will permit.

I am convinced that the people of the United States have about had their fill of what appears to be an endless program of Government economic aid to foreign countries. I find in my travels throughout the world that the really responsible people in recipient countries question the soundness of an aid program on any permanent basis. As a temporary program to insure rapid revival of the economies of Western Europe following World War II, I firmly believe that the Marshall plan may have preserved from Communist unrest a most important part of free world culture.

But it should be apparent to all that something more dynamic and less artificial must now be employed to develop the economic resources of all countries outside the Communist orbit. The last Congress recognized the significance of further expansion of trade by extending the reciprocal trade agreement legislation for another 4 years. It is most encouraging that this program, conceived and inspired by one of the greatest Secretaries of State of all time, Hon. Cordell Hull, has now become truly bipartisan.

President Eisenhower has frequently stated that increased private investment is essential to the economic progress of less developed countries. In his recent budget message the President said:

"The greater share of investment capital and technical ability in the United States and other highly developed countries is to be found in private hands."

Thus far, however, the President in his series of messages to the Congress has failed to recommend any legislation in this area other than expansion of the program of guarantees to American private investors against losses caused by inconvertibility of currencies, expropriation, or war. Unfortunately, the administration still is in the study stage of possibilities for stimulating private investment abroad. As stated in the budget message:

"Studies are being conducted by the Department of State and the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce on

ways to increase the role of private investment, management, and technical training abroad."

It has fallen upon the Congress to assume the initiative in this as in many other areas which are vital to the American economy and the peace of the world. I say with some pride, we have a program equal to the task. Last December my Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy held a full week of hearings on the future prospects for U.S. private investment abroad. At that time statements were made by more than 50 representatives of agriculture, commerce and industry, and experts from government and academic life.

Most frequently mentioned in the testimony before our subcommittee was the recommendation for changes in the Federal tax structure to enable American private investment to go abroad on a basis competitive with investors from other countries. A number of specific recommendations were made for changes in the treatment of income from foreign sources. From these recommendations I selected those which seemed to have the greatest merit and common support. I have adapted these recommendations to conform with my own views, of course, and included them in a bill which I introduced on the opening day of the 86th Congress. This bill, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1959, will, I believe, encourage a substantial increase in American investment abroad.

The cornerstone of H.R. 5 is the provision for a new class of domestic corporation to conduct the foreign operations of American firms. Known as foreign business corporations, these companies would be permitted to retain the earnings derived from foreign operations for use in the expansion of foreign investment and trade activities without any immediate payment of U.S. tax. They would pay U.S. tax on foreign source income only when it is withdrawn from foreign operation, either by a distribution to shareholders or upon diversion to purposes unrelated to foreign operations. Income from foreign sources will qualify for deferral only if the foreign business corporation derives substantially all of its income from business done outside the United States.

In recent years, in order to compete with British, Canadian, French, or German businessmen, American businessmen have been compelled to seek tax shelter havens in Tangier, Lichtenstein or Panama, et al. Consequently, the proposed deferral of Federal tax burden upon earnings reinvested abroad will result in no significant loss of United States revenue; in fact, one of the witnesses before our committee predicted that, absent a change in Federal tax law during the next 5 years and assuming the world stays prosperous, he has no doubt that there would, at the end of this 5-year period, be little export income on which the United States will collect taxes. I firmly believe that United States businessmen should not be compelled to abandon the American flag when they go abroad: they should not be compelled to organize and operate under foreign flags but, instead, should be encouraged to go abroad and take with them their country's flag—and along with it the great combination of ingenuity, skill and daring that has made our free enterprise system the most dynamic economic system in the world.

You are all familiar with the tax treatment provided since 1942 for Western Hemisphere trade corporations. These corporations have been taxable at a rate 14 percentage points lower than the tax rates applicable to other corporations. These benefits are limited to a corporation which does all of its business in the Western Hemisphere. Section 4 of my bill would extend the same benefits to United States companies doing business in any foreign country if specified conditions as to kind and source of income are met. These qualifications are substan-

tially the same as those now prescribed for Western Hemisphere trade corporations except for an increase from 5 percent to 10 percent in the leeway allowed for incidental income from sources within the United States. Experience has shown that the present 5 percent limitation is too restrictive.

I understand there was some surprise when I included this section in my bill. I have been told that the budgetary facts of life will not permit even the temporary loss of revenue. I am certainly in favor of a balanced budget and shall do all in my power to curtail unnecessary Government expenditures. But I say to you that our chance for a balanced budget will be greater, if we provide encouragement for American business to assume directly more of the risk of economic development in the countries in the free world. Indeed, there is very likely to be a greater tax yield from a 38 percent rate of return on the increased volume of foreign activities of American business than from a 52 percent rate on the more restricted activities under existing law.

The reason for enactment of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provision in 1942 was that American corporations in South America were placed at a considerable competitive disadvantage with corporations from other countries. Since the same competitive inequity now exists throughout the free world, it is only fair that all U.S. corporations engaged in foreign trade should be treated alike. It is high time that we discard the provincialism which gave rise to this artificial distinction between East and West.

The 14 percentage point tax differential is justified by the same considerations whether the foreign operations be conducted in Pakistan or in Peru—in Burma or in Brazil—in the East Indies or in the West Indies.

One of the most perplexing problems encountered by American corporations which have engaged in foreign trade through subsidiaries organized in a foreign country has been that of shifting capital from a subsidiary in one foreign country to another subsidiary in another country, where the capital can be more effectively utilized. Under existing law it is not possible to make such transfers without recognition of gain or loss unless prior clearance is obtained from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Likewise, if the U.S. corporation finds it necessary to transfer appreciated assets to a foreign subsidiary, a taxable gain is recognized unless prior to the transfer the Commissioner looks into the transaction and senses no potential of tax savings.

I understand that some favorable rulings have been issued in some situations, but only after much delay—accompanied with considerable pain and suffering—and frequently on a very arbitrary basis. Section 3 of H.R. 5 would relieve this situation by providing that no advance ruling shall be necessary for property actually used in a trade or business outside the United States, or for stock in a corporation actively engaged in such a trade or business. The elimination of the requirement for advance clearance in such cases will be most beneficial to corporations which have been engaged in foreign trade for a long time; however, it will also afford assurance of companies now entering foreign trade that their capital can be shipped to other areas without arbitrary delays and uncertain tax consequences.

A potentially important technique for fostering private investment in underdeveloped areas is that of tax sparing. Many underdeveloped countries try to attract capital by waiving taxes for a limited period of time upon new enterprises, or upon investments in existing enterprises. However, a program of tax sparing offers no incentive to U.S. companies, for they must pay U.S. taxes on the waived profit. It has been suggested that American companies which accept in good



faith tax waivers extended to them by foreign governments should be deemed to have paid the waived foreign taxes for the purpose of the foreign tax credit provisions of the Revenue Code. The Treasury and State Departments have been much interested in this policy, and have recommended that it be accomplished by tax treaties. While many of these underdeveloped countries are not yet committed to the Soviet bloc, they are readily susceptible to domination by the Soviet bloc if that should appear to them to be their only source of capital. We may alienate otherwise friendly nations by thwarting their efforts to attract American capital by nullifying their tax sparing program with our tax laws. A serious difficulty exists in the efforts to implement tax sparing by tax treaty. Tax sparing by tax treaty circumvents congressional authority in the field of taxation. I prefer a legislative mandate which recognizes incentive tax sparing by foreign countries as taxes paid for the purposes of the U.S. foreign tax credit. Section 6 of the bill provides such a mandate, but the Secretary of State will be authorized to certify unilaterally which foreign tax-sparing legislation will be recognized for U.S. tax purposes. Under this approach the Secretary of State will not be required to negotiate complicated and time-consuming tax treaties. He may, of course, if he deems it a wise policy, negotiate executive agreements with foreign nations in order to obtain reciprocal benefits. On many occasions, this should prove to be an extremely useful instrument in implementing the foreign policy of our country.

Since the foreign tax credit provisions were first introduced into the taxing system, there has been a need for a liberalization of the strict country by country limitation. Equality of treatment has long demanded that each taxpayer have an option to choose between the country by country limitation and an overall limitation in determining his for-

ign tax credit. I have provided for this liberalization by prescribing an alternative means of computing the maximum amount of credit which can be allowed against the U.S. tax with respect to any taxes due foreign governments. It is only in this manner that the fundamental purpose of the foreign tax credit—the prevention of double taxation of income earned abroad—can truly be achieved.

Section 7 of my bill would correct an inequity in the present law, relating to gain realized by a parent company upon the involuntary conversion of property belonging to a foreign subsidiary. Frequently, a domestic corporation must do business through a subsidiary in a country in which it is either impossible or difficult to secure adequate insurance coverage. In these instances it is a normal practice for the domestic parent corporation to insure the property of the subsidiary doing business in that country. If the property of the foreign subsidiary is destroyed, say by fire or by storm, the domestic parent is required to pay a tax at ordinary income rates on the insurance proceeds received even though it uses these proceeds to replace the lost property. This tax penalty deters investments in foreign countries where this insurance problem exists. There is no justifiable reason for denying the parent corporation the usual non-recognition of gain upon involuntary conversions of this kind.

I have been much encouraged by the response which has followed my introduction of H.R. 5. Many of you undoubtedly have other equally sound proposals that you feel should be enacted. I am sure you will all recognize that there is a real danger in trying to accomplish too much. Many groups similar to yours have evidenced a genuine interest in this matter and have displayed an understanding of the necessity for the realistic approach which I have taken in this bill. I have been informed that the public

advisory groups established by the President in the world trade area can be expected to come forward with constructive recommendation in the tax field. I would hope that these reports may be forthcoming at an early date. In any event, I am encouraged by the fact that the administration in Washington is at least interesting itself in this very vital problem.

Some of the proposals included in H.R. 5 have been discussed for years and have been recommended by careful students of the impact of Federal taxes upon private foreign investment. We have had enough study. Now is the time to put them into effect. The immediate importance of private investment in providing a sound basis for supplementing and replacing foreign economic aid calls for action at this session of Congress. The American people must be given a practical alternative to the indefinite continuation of \$1½ to \$2 billion a year in appropriation for foreign economic aid and technical development.

The most effective way to carry the message of the American way into the uncommitted countries of the free world is to make available to them private capital and business management, which this country can provide. In the long run we shall not make friends by giving handouts, and we can only teach the dynamic character of the free enterprise system by demonstrating directly how it works. This is a great cause, and I should hope that you might make it your cause.

The final decision on the future of this measure really rests with the business community—alert businessmen such as yourselves—genuinely concerned with private enterprise and with assuring that our foreign economic policy truly reflects the basic principles of our free enterprise system. You are aware of the challenges that confront us. With your support, we can reach our goal.

Thank you.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 1959

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 15, 1959)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hensel E. Hendrickson, pastor of Kensett Lutheran Parish, Kensett, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, help us, we beseech Thee, to be aware of Thy abiding presence. The presence that has been revealed to us by Thy Word—that Thou will seek the lost, will bind up the crippled, will strengthen the weak, will watch over the strong, and will feed Thy sheep in justice.

We thank Thee for men who, in gratitude to Thee, fervently believe that the Nation's business should not proceed without prayer to their Heavenly Father. Today, as people in our small world are looking to this Nation for leadership and for kinship, let their eyes focus first on this moment of prayer, its significance to our people, and the cost paid for its preservation.

May we learn to measure our days by the missions being accomplished to Thy glory. As we have been blessed, help us to be a blessing to others, as we seek lost, bind cripples, strengthen weak, watch

over strong, and feed Thy sheep in justice. In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1959.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. MCCARTHY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 16, 1959, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the